

University of Nebraska - Lincoln

DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln

Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and
Clinical Psychology

Buros-Nebraska Series on Measurement and
Testing

1996

5. Exploring The Complexity Of Racial Identity Attitude Measures

Robert T. Carter

Teachers College, Columbia University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/burosbookmulticultural>

Carter, Robert T., "5. Exploring The Complexity Of Racial Identity Attitude Measures" (1996). *Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and Clinical Psychology*. 9.
<https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/burosbookmulticultural/9>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Buros-Nebraska Series on Measurement and Testing at DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln. It has been accepted for inclusion in Multicultural Assessment in Counseling and Clinical Psychology by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@University of Nebraska - Lincoln.

EXPLORING THE COMPLEXITY OF RACIAL IDENTITY ATTITUDE MEASURES

Robert T. Carter

Teachers College, Columbia University

In the 1970s theories of racial identity began to appear in the psychological literature. Several scholars working independently in various parts of the country introduced theories of Black racial identity development (see Helms, 1990). Since the 1970s, racial, ethnic, or minority identity theories have been introduced to include other visible racial/ethnic groups. The term "visible racial-ethnic" applies to Black, Asian, Indian, and Latino Americans; it identifies them as members of both racial and ethnic groups who are recognized by skin-color, physical features, and/or language. Ethnic or racial or cultural identity models have been proposed for Asians, Hispanics (Berry, 1980), and minorities in general (Atkinson, Morten, & Sue, 1989; Sue & Sue, 1990). In the mid 1980s Helms's White racial identity model was introduced (Helms, 1984).

Extensions and elaborations of racial identity theories have also appeared in the literature (e.g., Helms & Piper, 1994; Helms, 1994; Helms, this volume; Parham, 1989; Myers, Speight, Highlen, Cox, Reynolds, Adams, & Hanley, 1991; Sue & Sue, 1990). For instance, early models of racial identity were primarily stage models that described psychological responses to oppression. More recently, theories have evolved such that more emphasis is placed on racial identity as an aspect of an individual's psychological makeup in a race-based society (Carter, 1995; Helms, 1990; Helms & Piper, 1994). It is

apparent from the growing body of theoretical activity that racial identity is becoming a major theoretical and empirical model in psychology.

Corresponding with the theoretical activity surrounding racial identity, there has been an increase in empirical investigations stimulated by the development of Black and White racial identity measures (Helms & Carter, 1990; Helms & Parham, in press). Studies have demonstrated the reliability and validity of the racial identity constructs and measures (e.g., Carter & Helms, 1992; Carter, 1990a, 1990b, 1990c; Carter, Gushue, & Weitzman, 1994; Helms & Carter, 1991; Helms & Carter, 1990; Helms & Parham, in press; & Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1992; Tokar & Swanson, 1991; Taub & McEwen, 1992). Although there has been considerable empirical and theoretical work done with White and Black racial identity, somewhat less attention has been devoted to the underlying complexity of racial identity as reflected in the current racial identity instruments.

One purpose of this chapter is to examine the complexity of racial identity by examining scale construction. A second purpose is to examine two issues—one pertaining to how best to use raw or “scaled” scores and the other pertains to whether the scales that measure racial identity attitudes capture some of the complexity associated with identity issues as suggested by recent theory.

In the exploration of the complexity of racial identity measures, I first review the theoretical models and summarize some of the empirical support for the theories of Black and White racial identity. The reviews of research and theory are followed by descriptions of the development of the racial identity scales. After describing the measure’s psychometric development, I explore the question of using raw or scaled scores (i.e., percentile scores). The description of racial identity scales is followed by a discussion about using percentile scores as one type of scaled score. The chapter ends with a conclusion and implication section.

Review of Black and White Racial Identity Theory and Research

Before describing the racial identity theories, it is necessary to clarify terminology. The clarification is needed because of advances in the theory and the varying meanings associated with the terms. In the earlier models of Black and White racial identity the process of identity development was characterized in terms of stages. Cross (1978) and Thomas (1971), two original theorists, proposed models of Black racial identity that suggested a linear progression from one stage to another. Helms’s (1984) model of White racial identity also

proposed a stage model. However, since then, she has revised both Black and White racial identity models and suggested that each operates as a worldview that serves as a filter for race-based information. The ego is the psychological structure that holds and transforms racial identity information. Helms has recently proposed the use of the term ego "status" to refer to the various differentiations of ego that mark more mature and complex racial identity development. I have referred to the notion of "status" by using "level" (Carter, 1995; Carter & Goodwin, 1994). So in this chapter, the terms racial identity "status" and "level" will be used interchangeably.

Racial identity involves one's psychological interpretation of the meaning of his or her race and the race of others. Models of racial identity have existed in the psychological literature for some time (e.g., Thomas, 1971; Cross, 1980). However, only a few authors (e.g., Helms & Carter, 1990) have examined notions about racial identity through examination of how racial identity measures capture theoretical notions.

Racial identity statuses or levels (formerly stages; Helms, this volume) are composed of corresponding attitudes, thoughts, feelings, and behaviors towards both oneself as a member of a racial group and members of the dominant racial group (in this case Whites). The manner in which one's own racial identity is integrated into one's personality depends on numerous influences, such as family, society, one's own interpretive style, and the manner in which important social-political contexts influence this aspect of one's identity. The notion of status in contrast to stage suggests a model wherein a person may have as part of his or her ego structure all aspects of the racial identity statuses with one status having a predominant role in effecting one's worldview. Helms and Piper (1994) explain it this way:

The maturation process potentially involves increasingly sophisticated differentiations of the ego, called "ego statuses." Although it is possible for each of the racial-group appropriate statuses to develop in a person and govern her or his race-related behavior, whether or not they do depends on a combination of life experiences, especially intrapsychic dissonance and race-related environmental pressures, as well as cognitive readiness the statuses are hypothesized to develop or mature sequentially. That is, statuses share space within a multilayered circle (symbolizing the ego) and the status(es) which occupies the greatest percentage of the ego has the most wide ranging influence over the person's manner of functioning. (p. 126-128).

Black racial identity. Originally presented by Thomas (1971) and expanded by Cross (1978), and later Helms (1990, also this volume), Black racial identity development consists of five levels or statuses

called Pre-encounter, Encounter, Immersion-Emersion, Internalization, and Internalization-Commitment. Each status or level of racial identity consists of its own constellations of emotions, beliefs, motives, and behaviors, which influence its expression. The following descriptions are drawn from recent theoretical formulations, as presented by Helms (1990; this volume).

The psychological view that is characteristic of *Pre-Encounter*, the first level of racial identity, is the idea that race has little or no personal or social meaning. For this person, his or her life course is determined solely by his or her personality, ability, and effort. The belief that race has little personal salience can be expressed in two distinct ways—passively or actively (Helms, 1990). In the active phase, people characterized by Pre-encounter attitudes may consciously idealize Whiteness and White culture. They essentially want to be accepted into White society and culture; so they strive to assimilate.

At the Pre-encounter level of racial identity one may not be conscious of him/herself in the way described above. Such an individual may exhibit a passive expressive mode. One accepts the negative attributions associated with Blacks as a group and sees Blacks in traditional societal or stereotypic ways. Consequently considerable psychic energy may be invested in maintaining distance between him/herself and other Blacks. Passive expressions of Pre-encounter mirror views about race common to those of the dominant racial group in society.

Encounter. During the Encounter phase, something happens that manages to change the person's current feeling about herself/himself as a Black person in the United States. Encounter experiences usually involve multiple emotional traumas that are so powerful that they begin to weaken and break down the person's previous identity resolution. Slowly, the meaning and significance of race is questioned and examined. Initially, as is true when one's defenses are ineffective, these experiences are wrought with confusion and emotional turmoil. This emotional turmoil may be acute or chronic, eventually leading to the next level of identity. Thus, the person begins to view his/her racial identity more positively and works to become deeply involved in learning and experiencing the meaning and value of his or her race and unique culture. The psychological energy used to search for a new identity or resolve the conflict between the abandoned identity and finding something to replace it leads to the next level of racial identity.

During *Immersion-Emersion*, the individual becomes deeply involved in discovering his/her Black/African-American heritage and has idealized images and strong emotions about Blackness. Two

phases characterize this level of identity development. The first phase of the new identity status involves *Immersion*. One feels hostile and angry toward Whites. As a consequence, the individual *immerses* himself/herself in Black experiences (e.g., clubs, groups, political organizations, etc.) and withdraws, physically when possible, and when not, psychologically, from White society as a means of discovering and affirming his/her Black identity. In general, this identity level is characterized by idealization of everything Black. His/her Black pride is strong and unquestioned, and he/she devalues anyone (including other visible racial-ethnic group people) and all things that are associated with White culture or society. These perspectives arise in part as a consequence of the newly acquired information about the experiences of Blacks. The individual at this level of racial identity development is motivated by his or her desire to embrace the culture and history once denied or withheld. In time the intensity of *Immersion* subsides and the person begins to *emerge*. During the *Emersion* phase of *Immersion-Emersion*, the emotional intensity subsides and one no longer idealizes Blackness. A more balanced view of the strengths and weaknesses of Black life and experience emerges. This leveling off leads to internalization.

The *Internalization* status is characterized by the achievement of a sense of pride regarding one's Black identity and a sense of security with respect to one's racial heritage. "The person has found resolution of conflicts between the 'old' and 'new' worldview; ideological flexibility, psychological openness, and self-confidence about one's Blackness are evident in interpersonal transactions. Anti-White feelings decline to the point that friendships with White associates can be renegotiated. While still using Blacks as a primary reference group, the person moves toward a pluralistic and nonracist perspective" (Cross, Parham, & Helms, 1991, p. 32).

The individual at this level of racial identity development is motivated by pride in his/her racial-cultural heritage and may maintain his or her positive identity privately. Helms (1990) suggests that one may also engage in an active form of *Internalization* that is equivalent to Cross's (1978) original fifth stage, *Internalization-Commitment*. During the *Commitment* mode of *Internalization*, the individual has adopted a behavioral style that is characterized by social and political activism.

Research Support for Black Racial Identity

Racial identity attitudes for Blacks have been found to be associated with a range of emotional, personal, and socio-cultural characteristics. Empirical support for Black racial identity supports the

theoretical models have considerable merit. It is important to note that research has not kept pace with theory, so in describing the research, the term racial identity "attitude" will be used. The use of the term "attitude" reflects the fact that the racial identity measures assess attitudes that are presumed to capture important aspects of the racial identity statuses while not measuring all aspects of the statuses.

For example, Pre-encounter attitudes have been reported to be related to a preference for White counselors (Parham & Helms, 1981), high anxiety (Carter, 1991; Parham & Helms, 1985a), low self-regard, and low self-esteem (Parham & Helms, 1985a; Pyant & Yanico, 1991). Carter (1991) found that Pre-encounter attitudes were strongly related to more psychological dysfunction. Pyant and Yanico (1991) report that high Pre-encounter attitudes were related to low scores on a measure of psychological well-being and high scores on the Beck Depression scale. Watts and Carter (1991) found that adults with higher levels of Pre-encounter attitudes tended to have more favorable perceptions of the racial climate and did not perceive personal discrimination in their organization. Mitchell and Dell (1992) found that college students on the West coast who had high levels of Pre-encounter were less likely to participate in Black-oriented campus activities. Thus, high levels of Pre-Encounter attitudes seem to be associated with a low level of racial awareness and some psychological distress, as well as preferences for interactions with White people.

Encounter attitudes for college students were associated with low anxiety, high self-actualization, high self-regard, and a preference for Black counselors (Parham & Helms, 1981; Parham & Helms, 1985b). Pyant and Yanico (1991) found that non-college-students' Encounter attitudes were predictive of low psychological well-being, low self-esteem, and higher depression scale scores. Parham and Helms (1985a) found that Immersion attitudes were associated with low self-actualizing tendencies, low self-regard, and high anxiety and hostility. Martin and Nagayama-Hall (1992) found in a sample of middle-aged women that Encounter was associated with an external locus on control. The emotional turmoil believed to be characteristic of Encounter appears evident in the research findings. The seemingly conflicting findings may be the result of the two phases of Encounter. The initial stage would be more distressing than the later phase of discovery, which might be expected to be related to a greater sense of self-actualization and personal regard.

Persons with high levels of Immersion attitudes also were found to exhibit feelings of hostility. Carter (1991) reports that Immersion-Emersion attitudes were predictive of fewer memory problems and

more concern about drug use. Carter (1991) found that this level of racial identity was characterized by "cultural paranoia" (p. 112) or a hypersensitivity to feelings, attitudes, and behaviors motivated by racism. Also Austin, Carter, and Vaux (1990) suggest that people with high levels of these attitudes may believe that counseling may not be effective for them. Such person's were likely to participate in Black-oriented campus activities (Mitchell & Dell, 1992); but they were less likely to endorse feminist beliefs (Martin & Nagayama-Hall, 1992). Carter and Helms (1987) found that Immersion-Emersion attitudes were predictive of Afro-centric cultural values (e.g., Harmony with Nature, Collateral or group relations, and Doing activity). The research evidence regarding Immersion-Emersion attitudes suggests that a person with a predominance of these attitudes may try to be Black in stereotypical ways, he or she may prefer a Black world, and be distrustful of Whites and white institutions.

Carter and Helms (1987) found that Internalization attitudes were predictive of Afro-centric cultural values. Helms and Carter (1991) report that Internalization attitudes were related to preferences for Black counselors. Martin and Nagayama-Hall (1992) found that Internalization was associated with an internal locus of control. People characterized by internalization attitudes seem to be able to grow and change and are aware of racism, as members identified with Black American culture.

The body of research cited above that has used the Black racial identity scale reveals the complexity of one's psychological orientation to one's racial group. Based on the research evidence, racial identity, as proposed in theory, is associated with cultural, behavioral, affective, and psychological variables. Thus, it seems reasonable to conclude that the Black Racial Identity scale (Helms & Parham, in press) shows evidence of construct and content validity. Yet some debate exists in the literature about the validity of one of the Black racial identity subscales. Ponterotto and Wise (1987) have argued that the Encounter scale should be dropped because it did not hold up in a factor analytic study. Others (e.g., Smith, 1991) argue the racial identity theory, and by implication its measures, are not useful at all. The current body of empirical literature, however, does not support these arguments. Various investigations using diverse samples have found each measured level of Black racial identity to be differentially related to a range of variables in ways consistent with theory.

White Racial Identity Theory

White racial identity theory was initially introduced by Helms in 1984. At that time she proposed a five-stage developmental (Contact,

Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy) model in which one moved from a low level of identity development to a higher level. Most research on White racial identity has been conducted with the scale developed to measure the five-stage model (Helms & Carter, 1990). More recently, Helms (1990; 1992; this volume) has revised and expanded her model to incorporate the relationship between White racial identity and racism and she has expanded her model such that racial identity is described in terms of ego statuses.

Helms's (1990) revised theory of White racial identity development proposes a six-level or status process. Three levels or statuses—Contact, Disintegration, and Reintegration—represent the movements away from racism, and three latter levels or statuses—Pseudo-independence, Immersion-Emersion, and Autonomy—represent more complex and sophisticated ego identity statuses characterized by the eventual formation of a non-racist White racial identity.

Letting go of racism begins at the Contact level of White racial identity development. *Contact* begins when one encounters the idea or the fact of Black people. Attitudes about Blacks are usually accompanied by a lack of awareness of one's Whiteness. The person is only slightly aware of race and racial issues, and is not aware of his or her own acts of individual racism and benefits from institutional and cultural racism. People whose identity statuses are predominantly Contact usually have limited interracial social or occupational interactions with Blacks. Most interactions operate from an essentially color blind racial perspective. A person's increased cross-racial interaction will eventually result in the realization that norms do in fact govern cross-racial interaction and that Blacks are not treated the same in the U.S., no matter their accomplishments or social status.

The awareness of racial differences leads the White person to the *Disintegration* level or identity status. This level of White identity development is characterized by conscious awareness of one's Whiteness and feelings of conflict regarding that awareness. This status is accompanied by moral dilemmas. Although believing in equality, they discover that Blacks and Whites as groups, and as individuals, are not equals, regardless of statements to the contrary. What is of particular difficulty is learning the social price associated with cross-racial interactions. As a result, "the person comes to realize that they are caught between two racial groups. And that to maintain their position among Whites depends on how well they can split their personality" (Helms, 1990, p. 57).

This awareness is wrought with emotional upheavals. One experiences intense feelings of guilt, helplessness, shame, and anxiety. To reduce the emotional and cognitive confusion and conflict, one can (a) avoid Blacks altogether; (b) try to convince people that Blacks are not inferior; or (c) conclude that racism really does not exist, or, if it does, Whites today have little to do with it.

The power of group acceptance coupled with the socio-cultural depth of the beliefs in White superiority and Black and visible racial/ethnic group inferiority, makes it more likely that one would come to believe that racism does not exist or if it does it is a remnant of the past. Thus, one with these ideas enters the next level or identity status, *Reintegration*.

Reintegration is that level or status of White identity development where the person acknowledges that he or she is White and he or she adopts the belief in White racial superiority and Black or visible racial/ethnic group inferiority. These views may be held explicitly, as is the case with White supremacists, or implicitly as is typical of large numbers of Americans.

He or she comes to believe that White cultural and institutional racism is the White person's due because he or she has earned such privilege and preferences. Race-related negative conditions are assumed to result from Black people's inferior social, moral, and intellectual qualities. Thus, people at this [point] tend to selectively attend and reinterpret information to conform to stereotypes common to the society. Effectively, people at this stage may feel fear and anger; however, these feelings usually are not that conscious and are seldom overtly expressed. (Helms, 1990, p. 61)

For one who holds these views passively, they may just stay as far away from Blacks and people of color as possible. American society's norms regarding race and culture make it possible for many Whites to hold *Reintegration* attitudes. It may take some powerful event either with Blacks or Whites for a person to question and begin to abandon this type of racial identity. The multicultural movements may be the types of events that for many White Americans trigger an examination of long-held beliefs about race and culture. This type of questioning may lead the person to abandon racism and begin the process of developing a non-racist White identity.

The process of defining a positive White identity begins at the *Pseudo-Independence* level or status of identity. The person begins to re-examine his/her ideas and knowledge about race. They question the prevailing notions about Blacks and people of color that suggest they are innately inferior or deprived, or deviant from Whites, and

they begin to understand that Whites have responsibility for racism. Consequently, the individual becomes uncomfortable with being a White person and they start to alter their outlook. However, these changes are primarily intellectual. The Pseudo-Independent level is characterized by a sense of marginality. One is not as strongly identified with Whites and is not openly accepted by Blacks. The resolution is to join with other like-minded Whites, a realization that leads to the Immersion-Emersion level.

For Whites, the *Immersion-Emersion* level is distinct from the corresponding status for Blacks in that for Whites, they do not reject Blacks but embrace Whites. They change myths and misinformation about Blacks and people of color and Whites and replace them with accurate information about the historical and current significance and meaning of racial group memberships.

They also start a process of self-exploration and discovery, a process fueled by questions such as "What does it mean to be White?" and "Who do I want to be racially?" "How can I feel proud of my race without being racist?" These questions lead one to a path of learning and soul searching. Other Whites are sought out and become the source and locus for answers to the Immersion questions.

During Immersion, one may read about people who have had similar identity journeys. They may form White consciousness-raising groups. Changing Blacks or fighting for people of color is no longer their goal; they are more focused on changing Whites.

Emotional as well as cognitive restructuring can happen during this [phase]. Successful resolution of this stage apparently requires emotional catharsis [or release] in which the person reexperiences previous emotions that were denied or distorted (cf. Lipsky, 1978). Once these negative feelings are expressed, the person may begin to feel a euphoria perhaps akin to a religious rebirth. These positive feelings not only help to buttress the newly developing White identity, but provide the fuel by which the person can truly begin to tackle racism and oppression in its various forms. (Helms, 1990, p. 65)

Autonomy is entered when the person internalizes, nurtures, and applies the new meaning of whiteness and the person does not oppress, idealize, or denigrate people based on group memberships. Because race is no longer a psychological threat, he or she is able to have a more flexible worldview, and it is possible to abandon as much as possible cultural, institutional, and personal racism. Helms suggests that the person at this level of White identity development is open to new information about race and culture and, consequently, is able to operate more effectively across races. He or she is better able

to benefit from racial-cultural exchanges and sharing between members of various races and cultures. The person at this level of White identity also values and seeks out cross-racial/cultural experiences.

Research Support for White Racial Identity

Research has shown Contact attitudes to be related to low anxiety (McCaine, 1986), denial of the significance of race on the part of White women (Carter, 1990a), endorsement of racism by White men (Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994) social comfort with Blacks (Claney & Parker, 1988), and endorsement of traditional American cultural values (e.g., evil or mixed human nature, mastery over nature, and achievement orientation) (Carter & Helms, 1990).

People who were characterized by high levels of Disintegration attitudes were reported by Westbrook (cited in Helms, 1990) to endorse the statement "Blacks need help to graduate," and they had a hard time understanding the anger some Blacks expressed. Pope-Davis & Ottavi (1994) found that White men at this level of racial identity endorsed racist practices. Helms and Carter (1991) found that these attitudes were associated with preferences for White male and female counselors. One should note that a person at this level of White racial identity is capable of empathy when Blacks experience racial discrimination but is also unable to understand feelings of anger of Blacks. This contradiction shows how this status is characterized by confusion.

Carter (1990a) and Westbrook (cited in Helms, 1990) reported that Reintegration attitudes were related to symbolic racism. Westbrook found that people with high levels of Reintegration attitudes endorse the statement "Affirmative action gives Blacks too many jobs." Also Reintegration attitudes were predictive of racism for White males and females (Carter, 1990; Pope-Davis & Ottavi, 1994), traditional American cultural values (Carter & Helms, 1990), and low self-actualization (Tokar & Swanson, 1991). Thus, it seems that Reintegration attitudes are related to endorsement of traditional American cultural values, interpersonal discomfort, and racist and negative visions of Blacks.

Whereas Pseudo-Independent attitudes were found by Helms and Carter (1991) to be predictive of preference for White, particularly female, counselors, Westbrook (cited in Helms, 1990) reported that interracial marriage and dating were approved of by people with high Pseudo-Independence attitudes. Claney and Parker (1988) found these attitudes to be related to feeling comfortable with Blacks in various situations. Neither McCaine (1986) nor Carter (1988) found these attitudes to be associated with affect in their studies. Also

Ottavi, Pope-Davis, and Dings (1994) found these attitudes to be related to self-reported multicultural competencies. A predominance of Pseudo-Independent attitudes seems to be associated with a shift from traditional cultural values to a transitional state. The person's racial views suggest more acceptance of Blacks, but he/she still prefers Whites when help is sought. There also seems to be less emotional investment in racial issues.

Autonomy attitudes were related to support of racial integration and the belief that there were no differences in Blacks and Whites in committing crimes on campus (Westbrook, cited in Helms, 1990). Helms and Carter (1991) found no preference for White counselors among those with high Autonomy attitudes. Tokar and Swanson (1991) found that "a secure appreciation and acceptance of oneself and others [Autonomy] appears to be associated with a liberation from rigid adherence to social pressures and with a strong inner reliance (inner directedness)" (p. 299). High levels of Autonomy attitudes clearly show a qualitative difference in one's perception of race and race relations. There is less emphasis on only White relationships and the person is secure in his/her relationships. The individual also has developed a stronger self-concept.

Underlying Dimensions in Racial Identity Theory and Research

The review of theory and research involving racial identity suggests that the Black and White theories of racial identity should be discussed separately. That is, although both types of identity have to do with race, they are not similar. Also because both White and Black racial identity processes involve an understanding of both racial groups there are some interrelationships between them. But given the nature of racism and race relations in the United States, the manner of expression and maturation of racial identity are distinctly different for the two groups.

Regarding Black racial identity, the theory proposes a distinct dimension or form of expression in which race is not salient. This process is characterized primarily by a strong Pre-encounter status. The second dimension is characterized by predominance of the Encounter status that is marked by transition and confusion, and a final dimension seems to be found in the expression of intellectual and later emotional investment in racial identity. In effect, in the latter dimension, the person finds and internalizes a Black identity.

For White racial identity two dimensions are proposed. One involves abandonment of racism with a predominance of Disintegration and Reintegration Attitudes. The other dimension is associated

with identity statuses that involve some type of racial acceptance. Racial acceptance may be expressed through Contact, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy statuses. However, the more advanced racial identity levels might predominate in a dimension associated with developing a positive White identity.

Measurement Issues

As stated above, this section reviews previous information about the racial identity instruments such as factor analytic information and psychometric data. I use this information as the first step toward exploring whether the various dimensions suggested by theory are supported psychometrically; that is, are they present in the racial identity instruments? Recall that the primary inquiry in this chapter involves the appropriate use of racial identity scale scores. That is, is it appropriate or accurate to report and use, in empirical studies, raw scores, or should raw scores be transformed? In other words, should researchers report and use racial identity scores obtained from samples in specific studies (i.e., sample raw scores) or should scores be transformed using percentile norms that best reflect the relative levels of racial identity in investigations?

These issues are explored with each racial identity instrument separately. Scale construction is reviewed. Then results of cluster analyses computed for this chapter are presented using both raw and transformed scores. These sections are followed by a discussion on implications for counseling and assessment.

Construction of The White Racial Identity Attitudes Scale

As indicated by Helms and Carter (1990), the White Racial Identity Scale consists of five subscales, each designed to measure one of the five (Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy) levels of White racial identity. Helms and Carter (1990) reported that the scale's items were not related to social desirability as measured by Crowne and Marlowe's (1964) Social Desirability Scale.

Scoring is done by summing or averaging Likert items for each subscale. High scores reflect greater endorsement of the particular attitudinal scale. Helms and Carter recommended that it is best to use all five subscale scores like a profile rather than use a single score to assign a person to a single level. They also presented a preliminary set of percentiles ($n = 506$) that researchers can use to transform the raw scores from each scale to fit the distribution of the norm group.

However, few studies (e.g., Carter & Helms, 1992) to the author's knowledge have used the norm group to transform raw scores.

One question explored in this chapter is whether transformed scores (i.e., percentiles) or raw scores affect the interpretation of one's findings. That is, does a researcher get a different profile when using raw versus percentile scores? Helms and Carter (1990) also present both interscale correlations and the results of a factor analysis of the scale items. Following is a discussion of how the factor structure interpretation can be seen in terms of possible underlying dimensions in the overall measure.

Item Factor Analysis

To explore whether the two dimensions (i.e., abandoning racism and developing a nonracist identity) proposed by theory were discernible in the psychometric information reported by Helms and Carter (1990), I grouped the factors they reported according to racial identity scale, factor theme, and item loadings. This grouping is

Table 1. Summary of White Racial Identity Factors Reported by Helms and Carter.

Type of Factor	Racial Distance and Discomfort	
R & D	White superiority	(Factor 1; 11 positively loaded items)
C & D	Lack of awareness of race/people are people	(Factor 9; 3 items and Factor 2; 4 negative items)
D	Against cross-racial relationships	(Factor 8; 2 negatively loaded items)
D	Anxiety or insecurity	(Factor 2; 7 positively loaded items)
C	Curiosity	(Factor 3; 6 positively loaded items)
D & R	Confusion, frustration, anger	(Factor 4; 5 positively loaded items)
D & R	White racial injustice	(Factor 5; 8 positively loaded items)
C	Family taught color-blindness	(Factor 11; 4 positively loaded items)
Racial Awareness and Acceptance		
PI & A	Racial equality	(Factor 1; 8 negatively loaded items)
PI & A	For cross-racial relationships	(Factor 8; 2 positively loaded items)
PI & A	Comfortable in racial situations	(Factor 10; 2 positively and 1 negatively loaded items)

Note: The Factor letters correspond to White racial identity scales: C=Contact, D=Disintegration, R=Reintegration, PI=Pseudo-Independence, A=Autonomy.

offered simply as a way to see how the factor analysis they conducted might reveal other aspects of the instrument. The reader might find that some items loaded on more than one factor and as a result more than 50 items appear on the table. For a more detailed discussion of the factor structure, see Helms and Carter (1990). Helms and Carter (1990) found that the 50 items comprised 11 factors. Inspection of Table 1 shows that the eleven factors, can be grouped into two distinct categories that seem to involve two primary dimensions that I have labeled racial distance/discomfort and racial awareness/acceptance.

Scale Intercorrelations

The scale intercorrelations, as shown in Table 2, reported by Helms and Carter (1990) showed that Contact was positively correlated with Pseudo-Independence ($r = .49$) and Autonomy ($r = .39$) and negatively correlated with Disintegration ($r = -.20$) and Reintegration ($r = -.32$). Disintegration and Reintegration were positively correlated ($r = .72$) with one another and negatively correlated with Pseudo-Independence ($r = -.52$) and ($r = -.55$) respectively, and Autonomy ($r = -.63$) and ($r = -.49$), respectively. According to Helms and Carter, the directions and magnitude of the interscale correlations support theoretical propositions. The directions and size of the correlations suggest that Contact, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy are attitudes associated with some type of racial acceptance, albeit for different reasons. The size of the correlations between Contact and Pseudo-Independence ($r = .49$) and Autonomy ($r = .39$) suggest more similarity between Contact and Pseudo-Independence and a weaker relationship with Autonomy. The interscale correlations confirm the underlying similarity of these three White racial identity attitudes and at the same time confirm some degree of independence from one another. Also the correlations suggest that each attitude represents a distinct racial identity status.

Table 2. Summary of Matrix of Correlations among the White Racial Identity Attitude Scales.

Scales	2	3	4	5
Contact (1)	-.20	-.32	.49	.39
Disintegration (2)		.72	-.52	-.63
Reintegration (3)			-.55	-.49
Pseudo-Independence (4)				.63
Autonomy (5)				

Note: Reprinted with permission from J. E. Helms and R. T. Carter (1990). Development of the White Racial Identity Inventory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black And White Racial Identity*, Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Similarly, the positive correlations between Reintegration and Disintegration suggest these two attitudes are related. The negative correlations between Contact, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy, and the former attitudes confirm, by direction and magnitude, the lack of connection between these two dimensions of racial identity. Yet the relationships also confirm that similar underlying identity dimensions are being assessed by Reintegration and Disintegration. Lastly, Pseudo-Independence and Autonomy are positively correlated indicating concordance between these closely related levels of racial identity, and at the same time, some distinctiveness.

Some (e.g., Swanson, Tokar, & Davis, 1994) argue that the scale intercorrelations between Disintegration and Reintegration suggests that the scales are not distinct and should be combined. When one considers internal consistency reliability coefficients in conjunction with interscale correlations it might seem reasonable to come to such a conclusion. However, to infer that the scales do not measure attitudes independently, solely based on one sample's reliability coefficients and interscale correlations, one must ignore three related factors. First, internal consistency reliabilities from study to study may be artifacts of the existence or the presence of attitudes in the sample or the environment rather than an artifact of the scales (Helms, 1989; this volume). Second, interscale correlations from varying samples may also reflect environmental or situational aspects of samples as is true of other developmental and personality measures. Therefore, it may be erroneous to conclude that the measures of racial identity should yield common scale scores across each sample. Third, researchers (e.g., Swanson, Tokar, & Davis, 1994; Yanico, Swanson, & Tokar, 1994) who argue that the scales do not measure distinct levels of racial identity must ignore the body of empirical research that consistently and strongly indicates that each scale of White and Black racial identity differently predicts psychological, social, and personal attributes across samples and environments in several studies. If the scales were unstable this could not be true (see the research review section).

In summary, the pattern of interscale correlations and the grouping of the factors from the item factor analysis suggests two general styles of "White racial identity attitudes might exist; one characterized by reactivity and general discomfort with racial issues and the other characterized by positivity and intellectual and emotional comfort with racial issues" (Helms & Carter, 1990, p. 72). These two dimensions seem to be consistent with discomfort with racial issues and the racial awareness and acceptance theme. One may note that the

evidence of underlying dimensions for White racial identity is currently derived from the factor analysis of items previously done by Helms and Carter (1990) and is basically interpretative. The second source of evidence for underlying dimensions in the White racial identity scale is from the interscale correlations discussed above.

Cluster analyses were calculated, separately for the racial identity instruments to determine the underlying structure of the five White racial identity subscales and the four Black racial identity subscales. If, in fact, distinct dimensions exist as suggested by theory, they should be determined from the subscales. The underlying dimensions were to be derived from discrete scale sets rather than overlapping items. Once a cluster solution was found, the raw scores and percentiles were compared to explore the question of which type of score is best for interpreting the scale results and the cluster profile.

Cluster Analysis: What Does It Tell Us?

It might be helpful to clarify the distinction between cluster analysis and factor analysis, particularly because both statistical methods can be used to identify distinct structures in a data set. Both procedures are used to simplify a multivariate data set. However, factor analysis may assign a variable item to several factors. It does this because the variance is partitioned among more than one source, whereas a cluster analysis uses one source in partitioning the variance. The single source aspect of cluster analysis then creates groups of variables that can be considered discrete. The situation for factor analysis, however, where no discrete set of variables is generated makes interpreting the factors somewhat less clear (Borgan & Barnett, 1987). Therefore, cluster analyses of the Racial Identity Scales were used to explore the question of underlying dimensions.

White Racial Identity Cluster Analysis

In an effort to explore the underlying complexity of the White racial identity measure, a cluster analysis was conducted on the five White Racial Identity subscales (Contact, Disintegration, Reintegration, Pseudo-Independence, and Autonomy), using 506 white participants who were college students from large Eastern and Midwestern universities. I used the method of nearest centroid sorting cluster procedure. This method forms a partition of cases in which the cases are mutually exclusive and exhaustive (Anderberg, 1973). The cluster solutions revealed information about the underlying dimensions of the racial identity scales. (Four possible solutions were attempted—2, 3, 4, and 5 clusters. Means, case groupings, and cluster interpret-

ability were used to select the appropriate cluster solution.) Table 3 shows the distribution of cases for the four possible cluster solutions. Through examination of the final cluster centers and the number of cases in each cluster it was determined that a two cluster solution represented the best fit in terms of number of cases classified for the five racial identity scales.

Table 3. Summary of Distribution of Cases for Cluster Solutions for White Racial Identity Scales.

<u>5 Groups</u>	<u>Cases</u>
1	41
2	9
3	341
4	110
5	4
<u>4 Groups</u>	
1	4
2	349
3	8
4	144
<u>3 Groups</u>	
1	254
2	247
3	4
<u>2 Groups</u>	
1	185
2	320

I used a Cluster procedure available from SPSSX. This procedure uses a partitioning algorithm, as noted above, which creates clusters by finding cluster centers based on the values of the cluster variables (i.e., racial identity subscales). It then assigns cases to the centers that are nearest to one another. Therefore, in this procedure an initial cluster center is found. This center represents an estimate of the mean value of each variable in the cluster. For each cluster solution attempted the number of centers were specified as either 2, 3, 4, or 5. The next step involves case classification to cluster centers using the squared Euclidean distance. Finally, each case is reassigned to a cluster center that is nearest to the updated classified cluster center. These final clusters result from variable means for the cases. The five-cluster solution had 9, 4, and 41 cases in three different clusters and the remaining cases were distributed between two clusters. Similar patterns occurred for the 4- and 3-cluster solutions. The final cluster

solution was determined by inspection of scale means, case groupings, and interpretability. Therefore, the two-cluster solution appeared to be the best in terms of case distribution and other criteria.

Use of Scaled Scores

Once a cluster solution was found, I determined the particular character of each cluster. In order to characterize the cluster, I examined the rank ordering of the subscale mean scores. The highest mean score was assigned the 1st rank and so on, thus generating a profile of the cluster.

The two clusters' raw scale scores were transformed to percentiles using newly developed normative tables presented in Tables 8 and 9. This way the two types (i.e., raw vs. percentile) of scale scores can be compared. Thus, each cluster can be understood as a profile in which attitudes can be seen having varying influences determined by their percentile ranking. In this way the transformed Profile Cluster, one called Racial Discomfort, is more strongly influenced by Reintegration and Disintegration Attitudes and minimally influenced by Autonomy, Contact, and Pseudo-Independence Attitudes (see Table 4). It therefore is more strongly related to what Helms calls "letting go of a racist identity" phase of white identity development. On the other hand, Cluster profile 2—Racial Acceptance—is more strongly influenced by Pseudo-Independence, Contact, and Autonomy Attitudes and less influenced by Disintegration and Reintegration. Upon inspection of Table 4, one can see that the profiles are almost opposite of one another.

Table 4. Summary of Clusters and White Racial Identity Raw and Percentile Scale Scores.

Racial Discomfort Cluster 1 N=185				Limited Racial Acceptance Cluster 2 N=320			
Subscale	Raw Score	Scale	% ile	Scale	Raw Score	Scale	% ile
PI	32	R	85	PI	39	PI	90
R	31	D	80	A	36	C	50
D	30	PI	30	C	32	A	40
A	30	C	20	D	22	R	35
C	28	A	10	R	22	D	30

Note: The Factor letters correspond to White racial identity scales: C=Contact, D=Disintegration, R=Reintegration, PI=Pseudo-Independence, A=Autonomy.

However, inspection of Table 4 suggests that the ranking or relative influence of each racial identity score in a profile was less apparent when only raw scores were used. The raw score ranking for both clusters were somewhat different. For instance, both raw score profiles had Pseudo-Independence as the highest scale raw scores, which might suggest that it was the attitude with the greatest influence in each profile. For example, in raw score Cluster 1 Pseudo-Independence, Reintegration, Disintegration, Autonomy, and Contact followed in the enumerated order. The score distances were not large at all with only 4 points separating the highest score 32 (Pseudo-Independence) from the lowest scale score at 28 (Contact). The raw score configuration could clearly be misleading particularly when one compares the raw score with its corresponding percentile score. The percentile clearly showed that a score's meaningfulness is enhanced when the scale score is considered in light of the transformation. Other types of procedures for score transformations might also yield different configurations (see Helms, this volume).

The Racial Acceptance Cluster raw score ranking also changed when raw scores were transformed to percentiles. What became clearer is the relative contribution to the overall cluster profile of the respective scale scores. It is clear using percentiles that Pseudo-Independence had the strongest contribution. Examining the raw scores would lead one to believe that Pseudo-Independence had a slightly greater contribution in comparison to Autonomy. These findings strongly suggest that empirical investigators should begin using (where percentile is only one type of many possible alternatives) transformed data in interpreting scale scores in studies using the White racial identity scale. Otherwise the scale scores meaning may well be distorted or misleading.

Construction of the Black Racial Identity Attitudes Scale

Helms and Parham (in press) developed the Black Racial Identity Attitudes Scale to measure cognitive aspects of the racial identity worldview proposed in the descriptions of racial identity in Cross's early (1978) work.

The measure was derived in part from the Q-Sort procedures introduced by Hall, Cross, and Freedle (1972). Versions of the scale have been in existence since Parham and Helms's (1981) study on preference for counselor race. The first version of the scale (Short Form A) was used in the original study and was the version derived from Hall, Cross, and Freedle (1972).

A second version of the scale (Short Form B) was developed via factor analysis of data from Parham and Helms's (1981) and Carter

and Helms's (1987) studies. The factorally derived scales were similar to the original (Short Form A). Additional items were added and a long form version was developed. In general, the internal consistency for each version of the scale has been stable.

As with the White Racial Identity Scale, each respondent has a score for each scale by adding the appropriate items or averaging by number of items for each scale. Regarding use of scale scores, Helms and Parham (in press) point out "Although some may wish to assign subjects to a single stage by using their highest scale score....[we] recommend that patterns of elevations and/or weighted linear combinations of the attitudes be used for interpretative purposes."

Helms (1990) explored the underlying structure of the Black Racial Identity Scale (Short Form B) by using a multidimensional scaling analysis. Her analysis revealed four dimensions. She named the dimensions, rational acceptance, anti-White feelings, anti-Black, and positive Black feelings. "The purpose of the analysis was to determine the nature of the structure underlying the items" (Helms, 1990, p. 38). However, it should be noted that this analysis, like factor analysis, was done on items.

Interscale Correlations

Table 5 shows a correlation matrix of the four Black Racial Identity scales from the long form version of the measure. Inspection of Table 5 shows that Pre-encounter is positively related to Immersion and negatively related to Encounter and Internalization. The correlation with Encounter is essentially zero suggesting that these phases of racial identity may be quite distinct or reflecting the transient character of Encounter. The positive, although moderate, correlation with Immersion might be somewhat puzzling, except when one considers how these levels of racial identity involve stereotypical perspectives of Blacks. Also

Table 5. Summary of Matrix of Correlations among the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale—Long Form

Scales	2	3	4
Pre-encounter (1)	-.001	.35*	-.58*
Encounter (2)		.46*	.33*
Immersion/Emersion (3)			-.06
Internalization (4)			

Note: All significant correlations indicated by (*) are at or beyond the .01 significance level.

the small negative relationship between Immersion-Emersion and Internalization suggests that these levels of development are quite distinct.

Cluster Analysis of Black Racial Identity Scale

The long form, consisting of 39 items of the Black Racial Identity Scale, was used in this analysis. The cluster groups for the Black Racial Identity Scales are shown in Table 6. The analysis was conducted in the same way as it was for the White Racial Identity Scale. A similar procedure was used, involving inspection of scale means, case groupings, and interpretability to select the appropriate cluster solution. It seems that a three-cluster solution best fit the data. A three-cluster solution suggested that three dimensions or processes might underlie measurement of Black Racial Identity.

From a first glance at the raw scores, it appeared that the three clusters were not actually distinct from one another. Clusters 2 and 3 had the same rankings of scale scores, with highest ranks for the Internalization and Pre-encounter scales. Cluster 3 reversed the two top ranked scales, and the last two scales were similar in ranking. However, by using percentile tables (see Tables 7, 8) the ranking and profile configurations changed, suggesting distinct profiles within each cluster. The profiles seemed to indicate that the scales might actually measure three aspects or dimensions of Black Racial Identity.

Table 6. A Black Racial Identity Cluster Solutions.
Summary of Distribution of Cases for Various Clusters

<u>5 Groups</u>	<u>Cases</u>
1	3
2	31
3	199
4	227
5	153
<u>4 Groups</u>	
1	427
2	141
3	3
4	42
<u>3 Groups</u>	
1	138
2	188
3	287
<u>2 Groups</u>	
1	176
2	437

These clusters seemed to capture the anti-Black pro-White or Pre-encounter dimension, the transitional phase of identity development marked by confusion, and the internalized phase of pride and personal integration of race and one's own personal style or perspective.

The first cluster called pro-White had its strongest influence from Pre-encounter attitudes followed by Immersion-Emersion, and less influence from Encounter and Internalization. It may be that those elements of Immersion that are focused on stereotypic aspects of Black life that are common in the socio-cultural folklore might contribute to Pre-encounter pro-White beliefs.

The racial confusion cluster comprises strong influences from all four racial identity attitudes. The greatest influence is from Immersion-Emersion, which represents strong idealized attitudes and feelings about race. Yet one has not quite developed a firm or consistent Black identity.

Table 7. Summary of Cluster Raw and Percentile Scores for Black Racial Identity Scales

"Pro-White" Cluster 1			
Scale	Raw Score	Scale	% ile
PRE	41	PRE	90
INT	31	IEM	85
IEM	30	ENC	30
ENC	30	INT	20
"Racial Confusion" Cluster 2			
INT	50	IEM	90
PRE	33	INT	85
IEM	26	PRE	70
ENC	14	ENC	70
"Racial Pride" Cluster 3			
INT	49	INT	80
PRE	26	IEM	50
IEM	20	ENC	50
ENC	12	PRE	43

Note: PRE = Pre-Encounter, ENC = Encounter, IEM = Immersion-Emersion and INT = Internalization.

Table 8. Percentiles of White Racial Identity Scales.

N = 1018					
Racial Identity Attitude Scales					
Scale	Contact	Disintegration	Reintegration	Pseudo-Independence	Autonomy
Percentiles	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F	M/F
99	43 (42/43.77)	37 (37/37.77)	41 (41/42.54)	46 (48/44.77)	47 (47/47)
90	37 (37/37)	32 (32/32)	32 (33/31)	40 (40/40)	43 (43/42)
80	35 (35/35)	30 (30/30)	30 (30/30)	38 (38/38)	41 (41/40)
70	34 (34/34)	28 (28/28)	28 (29/28)	37 (37/37)	39 (39/39)
60	33 (33/33)	27 (27/27)	26 (26/25)	36 (36/36)	38 (38/38)
50	32 (32/32)	25 (25/25)	24 (24/24)	35 (35/35)	37 (37/37)
40	30 (30/31)	24 (24/23)	23 (23/22)	33 (33/33)	36 (36/36)
30	30 (30/30)	22 (23/22)	21 (22/20)	32 (32/31)	34 (35/34)
20	28 (28/28)	20 (21/19)	19 (20/19)	29 (30/30)	33 (33/32)
10	26 (27/26)	18 (19/17)	17 (18/17)	29 (29/29)	30 (30/30)

This is seen in the equally strong influences of internalization followed by equal influences from Pre-encounter and Encounter.

Last, the Racial Pride cluster seems to be mostly influenced by Internalization attitudes suggesting that this cluster represents a dimension that reflects a clear movement into an integrated sense of racial history and personality. Less influence exists from the other attitudes. Thus, as was true for White racial identity, the underlying dimensions in the Black racial identity measure seem to reflect theoretical propositions. However, the dimensions found for Black racial identity are not apparent unless raw scores are transformed to percentile scores. When the normative transformation of scores is complete the profiles and clusters reflect theoretical notions more directly.

Conclusions and Implications

The current chapter has explored the complexity of racial identity instruments and examined whether it is advisable to use raw scores

or some type of score transformation (in this case percentiles). It has also offered new norm groups for both the Black and White scales (see Tables 8 and 9).

Sample Characteristics of Norm Group

The norm group used had the following demographic characteristics: Blacks ($n = 557$), 38% (212) male, and 62% (345) female; Ages ranged from 16-66 with a median of 20 ($M = 21$, $S.D. = 6.7$); Self-reported socioeconomic status was 30% ($n = 165$) lower/working class, 53% ($n = 293$) middle class, and 18% ($n = 99$) upper middle/upper class. Participants came from the Midwest (28%), Northeast (30%), and the Southeast (30%) and the remainder is unspecified. Whites ($n = 1,018$) 39% ($n = 400$) male, 61% ($n = 618$) female; Ages ranged from 17-65 with a median of 20 ($M = 21$, $S.D. = 4.6$); Self-reported socioeconomic status was 7.7% ($n = 78$) lower/working

Table 9. Percentiles of Black Racial Identity Scales.

<i>N</i> = 557				
Racial Identity Attitude Scales				
Scale Percentiles	Pre-Encounter M/F	Encounter M/F	Immersion-Emersion M/F	Internalization M/F
99	52 (52/52)	19 (19/19)	34 (34.91/31)	55 (55/55)
90	42 (42/41)	16 (16/16)	27 (28/26)	51 (51/51)
80	37 (37/37)	15 (15/15)	24 (25/24)	49 (49/49)
70	33 (33/33)	14 (14/14)	23 (24/23)	48 (48/48)
60	29 (29/29)	13 (13/13)	22 (23/21)	46 (45/46)
50	27 (27/27)	12 (12/13)	19 (20/19)	42 (42/43)
40	25 (25/25)	12 (12/12)	19 (20/19)	42 (42/43)
30	23 (23/23)	12 (12/11)	18 (19/17)	40 (40/40)
20	21 (21/21)	10 (11/10)	16 (17/16)	37 (36/37)
10	19 (19/19)	9 (9/9)	14 (15/13)	33 (33/33)

class, 54% ($n = 546$) middle class, and 39% ($n = 394$) were upper middle/upper class. Regions of the country were Southeast 17% ($n = 176$), Midwest, 30% ($n = 318$), Northeast 8% ($n = 80$), and West 11% ($n = 110$) and the remainder was unspecified.

The findings presented, unlike other studies (e.g., Ponterotto & Wise, 1987; Swanson et al., 1994) involving the same racial identity measures, used the scales to determine if any distinctive dimensions could be found in the instruments. Other investigations have tended to focus on items when examining psychometric aspects of racial identity instruments. The cluster analysis at the scale level represents a more appropriate analysis because, according to racial identity theories, racial identity is differentially expressed; in part the particular expression of each level is determined by the particular configuration of the racial identity levels. Therefore, if distinct dimensions were to exist in the instruments, they should be discernible from scale configurations rather than item configurations.

The present study demonstrates that both White and Black Racial identity instruments measure distinct dimensions of racial identity. The present findings illustrate that the measures and the theories from which they were derived are congruent, particularly when one considers individual scales and corrects for local or sample effects by normalizing scale scores.

Also, the findings reported here reinforce the idea that researchers should use scale profiles rather than the single scores or stage classification procedures where participants are grouped according to highest scores. The use of profiles allows for all scores to contribute to analyses, thus, allowing the researcher to discover which racial identity attitudes are related to his or her variables of interest.

Helms (1989; this volume) raised a number of issues pertaining to methodological concerns associated with racial identity, some of which are revisited in this volume. One of these concerns had to do with the influence of local racial climates on individuals and, in turn, on group racial identity expressions. She suggested that researchers may find low scale reliability as a consequence of racial climates that might influence racial identity levels of individuals. If she is correct, then students who volunteer to participate in a study may do so on the basis of their level of racial identity. This artifact of research may also affect percentiles. However, the advantage of transforming scores even to percentiles is that the effect of climate might be reduced when raw scores are transformed. The advantage of using transformed scores would be to alleviate some of the effects of racial environment brought about by subject selection or response bias.

It is my hope that researchers will begin to attend to the complexity of racial identity as demonstrated in the instruments. The findings reported here are encouraging and reaffirming in that theorists have instruments that not only measure specific aspects of the two models but also assess underlying theoretical notions.

Future researchers should be encouraged to use the measures and to adopt the score transformation procedures proposed. Perhaps larger scale studies and longitudinal studies might be undertaken that can confirm and advance our knowledge and measurement of racial identity. It should also be noted that a new set of percentile norms are presented. These norms are based on samples twice the size of the normative samples used by Helms and Carter (1990) and Helms and Parham (in press).

The current investigation may advance the use and exploration of racial identity instruments. It also, I hope, will serve as a caution to investigators who might rush quickly to conclusions about the racial identity measures, using results typically based on a single sample (Swanson et al., 1994; Yanico, Swanson, & Tokar, 1994).

It seems imperative that consumers, practitioners, and researchers remember that racial identity is an extremely complex phenomenon. The theory suggests all people come to some racial identity resolutions. This includes researchers and practitioners. It also includes the contexts and environments in which we all work and live. The interpretation of findings when racial identity instruments are used may simply reflect the levels of complexity of the person(s) interpreting the results or the person(s) being assessed. Therefore, all people concerned or interested in the area of racial identity assessment should be mindful of the dimensions of complexity found in people as described by theory, demonstrated by research, and assessed by the instruments.

REFERENCES

- Anderberg, M. J. (1973). *Cluster analysis for applications*. New York: Academic Press.
- Atkinson, P. R., Morten, G., & Sue, D. W. (1989). *Counseling American minorities* (3rd ed.). Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown Publishers.
- Austin, L. N., Carter, R. T., & Vaux, A. (1990). The role of racial identity in Black students' attitudes toward counseling and counseling centers. *Journal of Student Development*, 31(3), 237-243.
- Berry, J. W. (1980). Acculturation as varieties of adaptation. In A. M. Padilla (Ed.), *Acculturation theory, models, and some new findings* (pp. 118-126). Boulder, CO: Westview Press, Inc.

Borgan, F. H., & Barnett, D. C. (1987). Applying cluster analysis in counseling psychology research. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34(4), 456-468.

Carter, R. T. (1988). *An empirical test of a theory on the influence of racial identity attitudes on the counseling process within a workshop setting*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 431A.

Carter, R. T. (1990a). The relationship between racism and racial identity among White Americans: An exploratory investigation. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 69, 46-50.

Carter, R. T. (1990b). Does race or racial identity attitudes influence the counseling process in Black/White dyads? In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity attitudes: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 105-118). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Carter, R. T. (1990c). Does race or racial identity attitudes influence the counseling process in Black/White dyads? In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity attitudes: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 145-164). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Carter, R. T. (1991). Racial identity attitudes and psychological functioning. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 70, 164-173.

Carter, R. T. (1995). *The influence of race and racial identity in psychotherapy: Toward a racial inclusive model*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Carter, R. T., & Goodwin, A. L. (1994). Racial identity and education. *Review of Research in Education*, 20, 291-336.

Carter, R. T., Gushue, G. V., & Weitzman, L. M. (1994). White racial identity development and work values. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 185-197.

Carter, R. T., & Helms, J. E. (1987). The relationship of Black value-orientation to racial identity attitudes. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling Development*, 19, 185-195.

Carter, R. T., & Helms, J. E. (1990a). The intercultural values inventory. *Test in Microfiche Test Collection*. Princeton, NJ: Educational Testing Service.

Carter, R. T., & Helms, J. E. (1990b). White racial identity attitudes and cultural values. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity attitudes: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 105-118). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Carter, R. T., & Helms, J. E. (1992). The counseling process as defined by relationship types: A test of Helms's interactional model. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 20, 181-201.

Claney, D., & Parker, W. M. (1988). Assessing White racial consciousness and perceived comfort with Black individuals: A preliminary study. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 67, 449-451.

Cross, W. E. (1978). The Cross and Thomas models of psychological nigrescence. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 5, 13-19.

Cross, W. E. (1980). The Cross and Thomas models of psychological Nigrescence: A literature review. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Black Psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 81-89). New York: Harper & Row.

Cross, W. E. (1991). *Shades of Black*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Cross, S. W., Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1991). Nigrescence revisited: Theory and research. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Advances in Black psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 319-338). Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1964). *The approval motive: Studies in evaluative dependence*. New York: Wiley.

Hall, W. S., Cross, W. E., & Freedle, R. (1972). Stages in the development of Black awareness: An exploratory investigation. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Black Psychology* (1st ed., pp. 156-165). New York: Harper & Row.

Helms, J. E. (1984). Toward a theoretical explanation of the effects of race on counseling: A Black and White model. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 12(4), 153-165.

Helms, J. E. (1989). Considering some methodological issues in racial identity counseling research. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 17, 227-252.

Helms, J. E. (1990). *Black and white racial identity attitudes: Theory, research, and practice*. Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E. (1992). *Race is a nice thing to have*. Topeka, KS: Content Communications.

Helms, J. E. (1994). Racial identity and other "racial" constructs. In E. J. Trickett, R. Watts, & D. Birman (Eds.), *Human diversity* (pp. 285-311). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1990). Development of the White Racial Identity Inventory. In J. E. Helms (Ed.), *Black and White racial identity: Theory, research and practice* (pp. 145-164). Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Helms, J. E., & Carter, R. T. (1991). Relationship of White and Black racial identity attitudes and demographic similarity to counselor preference. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 38, 446-457.

Helms, J. E., & Parham, T. A. (in press). The Racial Identity Attitude Scale (RAIS). In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Handbook of Black personality measures*. Berkeley, CA: Cobbs & Henry, Inc.

Helms, J. E., & Parham, T. A. (in press). The development of the Racial Identity Attitude Scale. In R. L. Jones (Ed.), *Handbook of tests and measurements for Black populations*. Berkeley, CA: Cobb & Henry.

Helms, J. E., & Piper, R. E. (1994). Implications of racial identity theory for vocational psychology. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 44, 124-138.

Lipsky, S. (1978). Internalized oppression. *Black Reemergence*, 5-10.

Martin, J. K., & Nagayama-Hall, G. C. (1992). Thinking Black, thinking internal, thinking feminist. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 39, 509-514.

McCaine, J. (1986). *The relationship of conceptual systems to racial and gender identity and the impact of reference group identity development on interpersonal styles of behavior and levels of anxiety*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland, College Park.

Mitchell, S. L., & Dell, D. M. (1992). The relationship between black students' racial identity attitude and participation in campus activities. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33, 39-43.

Myers, L. J., Speight, P. L., Highlen, P. S., Cox, C. I., Reynolds, A. L., Adams, E. M., & Hanley, C. P. (1991). Identity development and worldview: Toward an optimal conceptualization. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 70, 54-63.

Parham, T. A. (1989). Cycles of psychological Nigresence. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 17, 187-226.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1981). The influence of black student's racial preference for counselor race. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 28, 250-257.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985a). Attitudes of racial identity and self-esteem of Black students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26, 143-147.

Parham, T. A., & Helms, J. E. (1985b). The relationship of racial identity attitudes to self-actualization of Black students and affective states. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 32, 431-440.

Ottavi, T. M., Pope-Davis, D. B., & Dings, J. G. (1994). Relationship between White racial identity attitudes and self-reported multicultural competencies. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 41, 149-154.

Pope-Davis, D. B., & Ottavi, T. M. (1992). The influence of White racial identity attitudes on racism among faculty members: A preliminary examination. *Journal of College Student Development*, 33(5), 389-394.

Pope-Davis, D. B., & Ottavi, T. M. (1994). The relationship between racism and racial identity among white Americans: A replication and extension. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 72, 293-297.

Ponterotto, J. G., & Wise, S. L. (1987). Construct validity study of the racial identity attitude scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 34, 123-131.

Pyant, C. T., & Yanico, B. J. (1991). Relationship of racial identity gender-role attitudes to Black women's psychological well-being. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 315-322.

Smith, E. J. (1991). Ethnic identity development: Toward the development of a theory within the context of majority/minority status. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 70*, 180-188.

Sue, D. W., & Sue, D. (1990). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Swanson, J. L., Tokar, D. M., & Davis, L. E. (1994). Content and construct validity of the White Racial Identity Attitude Scale. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44*, 198-217.

Taub, D. J., & McEwen, M. K. (1992). The relationship of racial identity attitudes to autonomy and mature interpersonal relationships in Black and White undergraduate women. *Journal of College Student Development, 33*(5), 439-446.

Thomas, C. W. (1971). *Boys no more*. Beverly Hills, CA: Glencoe Press.

Tokar, D. M., & Swanson, J. L. (1991). An investigation of the validity of Helm's (1984) model of White racial identity development. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 38*, 296-301.

Watts, R. J., & Carter, R. T. (1991). Psychological aspects of racism in organizations. *Group and Organizational Studies, 16*(3), 328-344.

Yanico, B. J., Swanson, J. L., & Tokar, D. M. (1994). A psychometric investigation of the Black Racial Identity Attitude Scale—Form B. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 44*, 218-234.

